

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/694,108	STAVELY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nelson D. Hernández	2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nelson D. Hernández. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Robert J. Brill. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 18 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 25.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



LIN YE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner placed a call to the attorney in record to indicate that in view of the subject matter in the Specifications, claim 25 would still raise issues that would render claim 25 to be rejected under 35 USC § 101. The Examiner indicated that the portions of the Specifications indicating that the computer readable medium may be a signal (not tangible) should be amended deleting the subject matter of the Specifications that would raise issues under 35 USC § 101 and the amendments must be accompanied by a clear disavowal of the deleted subject matter in order to remove said subject matter from the Original Disclosure. Also the Examiner indicated that figures 1A and 1B should be labeled as prior art as they are only described in the Background in the Specifications. The Attorney on record approved the suggested Examiner's amendments to delete the subject matter from the Specifications that would raise the issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 as a disavowal of the deleted subject matter in order to remove the embodiments that would raise issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 from the scope of the claims. The Attorney on record also acknowledged the changes needed to Figs. 1A and 1B.